



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,059	09/30/2003	Brent Dalmas Nelson	EDSC105US0	5833

34279 7590 02/05/2008
DOCKET CLERK, DM/EDS
P.O. DRAWER 800889
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

DAO, THUY CHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,059

Applicant(s)

NELSON, BRENT DALMAS

Examiner

Thuy Dao

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 19, 2007.
2. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicant's request, claims 1, 8, 10, 16, and 18-19 have been amended.
4. The 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejection over claim 8 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. However, they are not persuasive.
Claim 1 is the representative claim (Remarks, page 12, last paragraph).

a) The limitations "*substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks*" (Remarks, pp. 11-12, claim 1, lines 4-5).

The Applicant acknowledged that Vange teaches "rewriting HTML links" (Remarks, page 11, last paragraph, line 2), and then asserted that they are both standard links and Vange does not teach any "standards noncompliant hyperlinks" (Remarks, page 11, last paragraph, lines 7 and 3-4, respectively).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The claimed language merely calls for:
converting a first metamodel system that is standards-noncompliant into a second metamodel system that is standards-compliant (claim 1, lines 1-2);
substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant components with standards-compliant components (lines 4-17) ... "to yield said second metamodel system" (line 18, emphasis added).

That is to say, the claimed language defines converting a first metamodel system comprising a plurality of components, which are standards noncompliant with a second metamodel system (i.e., standards compliant with said first metamodel system) to other components, which are standards compliant with said second metamodel system.

Art Unit: 2192

In light of the plain language of the claims, Vange explicitly teaches *substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks* (e.g., [0022], reformatting data exchanged between client-server or between peers, [0008], [0063], and as acknowledged by the Applicant “rewriting HTML links” and “rewrites standard HTML links having absolute addresses (standards noncompliant with a second metamodel system) with standard HTML links having relative addresses (standards compliant with said second metamodel system)” (Remarks, page 11, last paragraph, lines 2 and 4-5, emphasis added).

b) The limitations *“substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant entity names associated with entities of said first metamodel system with standards-compliant entity names”* (Remarks, paragraphs 1-2, claim 1, lines 6-7).

Vange explicitly discloses substituting/rewriting/reformatting links, graphics files, text, image and audio files, HTML files, script files (e.g., [0024-0036], [0007-0010], [0031-0037], and FIG. 3, [0054-0063]).

c) The limitations *“substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant file names for associated files within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards compliant file names for said associated files”* (Remarks, page 12, paragraph 3, claim 1, lines 8-10).

Vange explicitly discloses substituting/rewriting graphics files with new names associated with new formats, HTML files with new names associated with XML format, script files with new names associated with new formats such as JavaScript or ActiveX (e.g., [0024-0036], [0009-0011], [0039], [0057], and FIG. 4, [0064-0076]).

d) The limitations *“organizing said entities having standards-compliant entity names into a plurality of files and folders having standards-compliant file names”* (Remarks, page 12, paragraph 4, claim 1, lines 11-12).

Art Unit: 2192

Vange explicitly discloses substituting/rewriting source entities, files, components within servers (e.g., FIG. 2A, files/folders standards compliant with servers 210-212) into target entities, files, components within Intermediary Server (e.g., IS 206 having Cache 204; FIG. 2B, storage of Front-End server 200, which stores files/folders standards compliant with Client 205); [0039], [0044-0045], and [0069]).

Accordingly, the examiner respectfully maintains the 35 USC §102 rejection over claims 1-20 as set forth below.

Specification

6. The specification is objected to because of minor informalities: page 3, lines 2-4, the sentence "*Wherever ... to maintain and extend the .*" is incomplete.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objection

7. Claim 2 is objected to because of minor informalities. The phrase is considered to read as - -The method of Claim [[I]] 1, further comprising ... - -.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vange (art of record, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0002625 A1 to Vange et al.).

Claim 1:

Vange discloses a system, a storage medium, and a *method for converting a first metamodel system that is standards-noncompliant into a second metamodel system that is standards-compliant* (e.g., FIG. 1, [0038-0042]), comprising the steps of:

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks (e.g., [0022], [0008], [0024-0025], [0063], FIG. 2B, [0047-0051]);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant entity names associated with entities of said first metamodel system with standards-compliant entity names (e.g., [0024-0036], [0007-0010], [0031-0037], FIG. 3, [0054-0063]);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant file names for associated files within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards compliant file names for said associated files (e.g., [0009-0011], [0039], [0057], FIG. 4, [0064-0076]; [0024-0036]);

organizing said entities having standards-compliant entity names into a plurality of files and folders having standards-compliant file names (e.g., FIG. 2A-2B and related text, [0039], [0044-0045], [0069]);

converting object identity values associated with objects within said first metamodel system into a single predetermined object identity value (e.g., [0045], [0069], source objects converted to target objects with single object identity value of 1 as unique target components stored in cache);

substituting standards-noncompliant relationship types within said first metamodel system with standards compliant relationships types (e.g., [0031], [0072], [0010-0012], source web pages embed images and audio files changes to target web pages do not embed images and audio files); and

substituting remaining standards-compliant mark-up language within said first metamodel system with standards compliant mark-up language to yield said second metamodel system (e.g., [0007-0009], [0035], [0087]).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *parsing automatically said files within said first metamodel system for said standards-noncompliant entity names* (e.g., [0007-0011], [0037-0039], [0057]).

Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *of associating said standards non-compliant entity names with said standards-compliant entity names in an index* (e.g., [0007-0010], [0031-0037]).

Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *associating said standards non-compliant file names with said standards-compliant file names in an index* (e.g., [0039], [0044-0045]).

Claim 5:

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *associating said standards non-compliant entity names with said standards-compliant entity names in an index* (e.g., [0007-0010], [0031-0037]).

Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *said standards-compliant hyperlinks substituting step further comprises the step of substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel System with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks using an index* (e.g., [0008], [0024-0025]).

Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *setting object identity values associated with objects within said first metamodel system into a single predetermined object identity value of 1* (e.g., [0045], [0069]).

Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *deriving said standards-compliant relationship types using relationship rules associated with a predetermined set of standardized relationship derivation rules* (e.g., [0031], [00723]).

Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Vange also discloses *verifying the operability of said second metamodel system with an associated model by testing the operation of said standards-compliant hyperlinks in said second metamodel system with said associated model* (e.g., FIG. 1, [0038-0042]; FIG. 3, [0054-0063]; FIG. 4A, [0064-0076]).

Claims 10-18:

Claims 10-18 are system versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 1-9, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the limitations of claims 10-18.

Claims 19-20:

Claims 19-20 are computer readable storage medium versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 1 and 8, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the limitations of claims 19-20.

10. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vignette V6 (art of record, "Vignette Engineering – Integration of Vignette V6 Content Suite and IBM Web Sphere Commerce Suite 5.1", April 2002).

Claim 1:

Vignette V6 discloses a system, a storage medium, and a *method for converting a first metamodel system that is standards-noncompliant into a second metamodel system that is standards-compliant* (e.g., page 3, Figure 2, Integration Control Flow; noncompliant metamodel in WebSphere Application Server; compliant metamodel in Vignette V6 Customer-facing Web Server), *comprising the steps of:*

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant hyperlinks within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards-compliant hyperlinks (e.g., page 6, Figure 6, "In Fashion" home page with links substituted by "Company XYZ" home page with associated links in page 7, Figure 8);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards-noncompliant entity names associated with entities of said first metamodel system with standards-compliant entity names (e.g., pp. 6-8, images, text, formats, icons);

substituting automatically a plurality of standards noncompliant file names for associated files within said first metamodel system with a plurality of standards compliant file names for said associated files (e.g., pp. 6-8, JSP templates, "header.jsp", "sidebar.jsp", and "footer.jsp");

organizing said entities having standards-compliant entity names into a plurality of files and folders having standards-compliant file names (e.g., page 4, files and folders, Administrative Console in WebSphere; page 5, files and folders, Content Manager in Vignette V6);

converting object identity values associated with objects within said first metamodel system into a single predetermined object identity value (e.g., page 10, Figure 10, Vignette V6 Keyword Manager, which sets object identity values of "men_s" "women_s" to predetermined value 1 as unique/separate objects);

substituting standards-noncompliant relationship types within said first metamodel system with standards compliant relationships types (e.g., pp. 5-6, source page "In Fashion" is not personalized; pp. 6-7, target page "Company XYZ" is personalized); *and*

substituting remaining standards-compliant mark-up language within said first metamodel system with standards compliant mark-up language to yield said second

Art Unit: 2192

metamodel system (e.g., page 11, 13-14, transforming/integrating all source pages and templates to target pages; page 3, Figure 2 and related text).

Claim 10:

Claim 10 is a system version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claim, it also teaches all of the limitations of claim 10.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 is a computer readable storage medium version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claim, it also teaches all of the limitations of claim 19.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570,

Art Unit: 2192

respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER